DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 433 004 IR 019 729

AUTHOR	Utley, Ginger; Qian, April; Eastmond, Nick
TITLE	An Evaluation of the SPIES Video Series (Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings).
PUB DATE	1999-04-26
NOTE	56p.; Research conducted by the class members, Introduction to Research for the Classroom Teacher Course 6550, Utah State University.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disabilities; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Instructional Material Evaluation; Instructional Materials; Interviews; Parent Materials; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Preschool Teachers; Questionnaires; Tables (Data); Teacher Education; Training; *Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS	Utah State University

ABSTRACT

The Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings (SPIES), funded by the State of Utah in conjunction with the Center for Persons with Disabilities at Utah State University, is an attempt to orient parents and teachers of preschool children to ways of dealing with children with disabilities. The primary vehicle for providing this training is a series of six videotapes with an accompanying printed manual. This report details the methods and results of a SPIES evaluation that was conducted as a class project. Class members worked in teams to use the class-designed instruments to interview technical experts, teachers, parents, and potential learners about their reaction to these materials. The evaluation was based on the criteria of appeal, effectiveness, and user-friendliness of the written, audio, and video materials in both the English and Spanish versions. Findings are summarized and suggestions provided for each of the six videos. The appendix includes the master record of responses, sample questionnaire, and proposal for formal evaluation. (AEF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 433 004

An Evaluation of the SPIES Video Series (Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings) Utah State University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.N. Eastmond

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

by

Ginger Utley

April Qian

Nick Eastmond

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Dept. of Instructional Technology
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322-2830

April 26, 1999

IR019729

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foreword

The Strategies for Preschool Intervention in Everyday Settings (SPIES) is an attempt to orient parents and teachers of preschool children to ways of dealing with children with disabilities. Based upon a commitment to early intervention, it was a project funded by the State of Utah in conjunction with the Center for Persons with Disabilities (CPD) at Utah State University. The primary vehicle for providing this training is a series of six videotapes, with an accompanying printed manual. The producer of this video series was Mr. Tom Risk, Director of K-SAR Productions, with help from K-SAR staff members and from faculty members of the Dept. of Special Education at Utah State University. The entire project was under the supervision of Dr. Sarah Rule, Associate Director of the Center for Persons with Disabilities.

As part of an ongoing arrangement with this office, members of the Introduction to Research for the Classroom Teacher course (Education 6550) used this as a class project during Spring Semester, 1999. Class members worked in teams to use the class-designed instruments to interview experts and potential learners about their reaction to these materials. The model for evaluation used was Martin Tessmer's Layers of Necessity model (from Planning and Conducting Formative Evaluations, 1997, London: Kogan Page). This is our written evaluation report.

While there were three primary authors, other class members contributed as well. Their contribution should be acknowledged. Other class members were:

Brian Anderson	Mindy Anderson
Marla Bailey	Deanna Campbell
Cherie Doe	Lory Farr
Jeramy Jenkins	Dixie Jenson
Jennifer Merritt	Stephanie Podgorski
Judy Ricks	Chloe Russell
Dan Trimble	Wendy Warner

We express our appreciation to all the participants who made this evaluation possible.

The SPIES Research Project:
An Evaluation of the SPIES Video Series

Written by Ginger Utley and April Qian
Research conducted by the class members of
Dr. Nick Eastmond's Educational Research Course 6550
Utah State University, 1999

Introduction:

This report details the methods and results of the SPIES research project that was conducted under the direction of Dr. Nick Eastmond and completed by his Education 6550 class members. The client for the study is Tom Risk, producer of the SPIES video series, who employed Dr. Eastmond's class to evaluate the video series based on the specific criteria of written, audio and visual components.

Why Was the Study Conducted?

This study was conducted to evaluate the SPIES video series. The evaluation was based on the criteria of appeal, effectiveness and user-friendliness of the written, audio and video materials, in both the English and Spanish versions. Respondents included experts in technical fields, special education, and parents of disabled children. The results of the study follow and incorporate numeric averages of responses as well as open-ended comments made by survey respondents.

Project Goals:	**Research Methods:**
Obtain wide variety of user responses	Survey experts and users who will provide valuable, varying responses
Obtain information on written, audio, and video quality	Ask a variety of questions based on a scale that can be averaged and rated
Obtain information for future projects (how to improve similar video series)	Ask open-ended questions regarding suggestions and ideas for improvements

What Did We Expect to Find in This Study?

We expected to get similar responses from each of the categories of respondents who were interviewed: technology experts, special education teachers and parents of disabled children. We hoped that there would be similarities within group respondents and slight variations between each respondent population based on expertise and experience. The variations were expected to form a valuable portion of the results in that they would provide three distinct, important perspectives from which to draw conclusions.

Who Participated in this Study?

The subjects were selected by each research team. Many of the technical and educational experts were on-campus faculty members, and parent-respondents were selected from among each team's personal connections and/or referrals.

How Was the Research Conducted and Compiled?

The researchers included two students per team with a total of six teams. Most teams opted to separate respondent groups for interviewing purposes: one person interviewed technical experts while the other person interviewed teachers and parents. The teams then came together and compiled their results in a team report. We then compiled all the team's results into a master list that generated totals and averages of responses.

Design of the Questionnaire:

The questionnaire was designed to include responses that could be measured and averaged as well as open-ended questions for original thoughts and ideas. See Appendix B for a model questionnaire; each survey team modified the questionnaire as they felt necessary.

Profile of Respondents:

We felt it necessary to gather background information on respondents in order to correctly categorized the data we received. The major characteristics of the respondents follows and is based on three criteria: type of expertise, background, researcher confidence in responses. Overall, interviewers had a relatively high level of confidence in their respondents.

Video Number	Field of Expertise	Background Info	Level of Confidence
1	Special Ed	Tutor	High
	Speech-language pathology	Special ed student	Good
	Communication disorders		High
1 (Spanish)	Speech-language pathology	Parents speak Spanish	Good
	Audiology, education, Spanish		Good
2	Special ed teacher	Special ed specialization	High

Video Number	Field of Expertise	Background Info	Level of Confidence
	Childhood education associate professor	Parent & school teacher	High
	Elementary education associate professor	Parent and special ed. aide	High
3	Early childhood special ed (2)	Parents with background in instructional design	High
	Instructional video business (2)	Design	High
4	Educational video director	Parent with special ed experience	Reliable
	Experienced teacher specialized in teaching and video making	Parent with special ed and comm. disorders experience	
	Family & human development, adult behavior problems program		
	Middle school special ed teacher		
5	Experienced first grade teacher	Parent w/background in comm disorders	High
	Preschool teacher	Parent	Medium
6	Audiology, high fidelity	Family and Human Dev. Major	High

Among the experts, 5 (25%) are audio-visual production experts, 11 (55%) are educators of various kinds, 4 (20%) are speech or communication specialists, and learners are either teachers or parents.

Findings/Results of the Study:

The first part of the questionnaire was focused on determining the quality of the instructional material. Questions were asked about the Appeal , Effectiveness and User-friendliness of the written, audio and video materials. The data has been gathered and reported in a manner that applies to the videos as a series; for a quality evaluation of each individual video-tape, please refer to individual team reports and questionnaires. To ensure the raw material is consistently interpreted, a record of all the original data is attached as Appendix A.

Overall Quality of the Videos:

For the 22 questions dealing with overall quality of the videos, and based on the 1-5 scale discussed previously, the average response was 3.90–a rating of "good" most closely matches the numeric average.

The questions that earned the highest scores from respondents are the following:

- Up-to-date information
- Transparent camera work
- Use of objectives
- Cohesive content (consistent to main topic)
- Use of understandable, up-to-date language

Learner Responses vs. Expert Responses:

When we break down the results by expert and learner, we found slightly different results. We consider a standard deviation of 0.1 and above a significant difference.

In regards to the high scores, on several occasions, experts responded with higher scores than did the learners. For example Questions 6, 8, 9,10, 11 & 13 received higher scores from experts while Questions 1, 2, 5, 12, and14 earned higher scores from learners. This is a phenomenon we expected to find, and we feel it adds validity to the study.

Report of 1-5 Scale Findings:

The following table incorporates questionnaires responses; the key ideas and opinions shown here represent major points taken from the six group reports. The numbers in parentheses represent the most common responses from each group report: on Appeal of Written Material, for instance, three teams' reported the most frequent response as "Good". The other comments are opinions and suggestions offered from various respondents; we incorporated those that occurred more than once.

	Written Material	**Audio**	**Video**
Appeal	Good (3) Nice outline Good supplement	Good (3) Fair (2) Sufficient Narration uninteresting Need Spanish audio	Good (4) Good sequencing Use teachers more in teaching concepts
Effectiveness	Good (2) Readable Understandable Fair	Good (4) Fair Audible Dry sometimes Subtitles difficult to follow	Good (4) Common sense info Real life examples Good content Helpful ideas
User-Friendliness	Good (3) Easy to follow	Good Fair (2)	Good (3) Easy to follow Fair Good translation Who was video made for?

Report of Open-Ended Questions Findings (including comments/suggestion):

The following results are taken from the open ended questions asked to each respondent. The comments, suggestions, and ideas that occurred more than once have numbers of occurrence in the parentheses following them.

General Positive Responses:

- It would be an excellent example for beginning speech people or para-professionals.
- I liked the examples that were natural. The example where the teacher sabotaged the situation by placing the sock on the hand instead of the foot was great!
- Organization was excellent, following a clear and directed plan.
- The product is very useful for learners. Parents and teachers who are being presented this information for the first time have a great deal to gain. Experienced individuals can use it as a review.
- Camera work / lighting is good.
- Very helpful for a university student in special ed, or in regular ed.

Suggestions for Improving Audio-Visual Quality:

- Video was fair for color, excellent for images, but cameraman made errors, like cutting the heads and bodies off and cutting in and out in views.
- Viewers had different opinions about the pacing of the videos. Some thought it was slow (4) and boring sometimes, others thought it was a bit too fast especially for beginners.
- Avoid narration on top of scenes that include audio.
- Audio not consistent sometimes. (2) (The dubbing over of some things the teacher said was interfering. Sometimes no audio or even contradictory audio was present when teacher had mouth movements.)
- Voice volume on audio low at times.
- Text should be over the motion video with reduced luminance on video images.

Suggestions for Improving Content Quality:

- Show more interesting examples. (5)
- Longer video segments or slower pace should be provided for new concepts, or have an index with the current topic being discussed highlighted. (2)
- Need the definition of the measure before going through the process.
- Use subtitles.
- Duration of the text on screen was too short on some sections.
- Summarize all of the concepts at the end of the video for reinforcement.
- Prerequisite knowledge for viewing makes it suitable for professionals rather than families.
- Instructionally accurate but boring.
- Use humor and do away with the monotone nature of the audio.
- Model the behavior of the teacher on camera (more show not tell).
- The written material should match the video exactly to improve clarity
- Should do small group tryout. (Follow one child through the steps to allow the learner to make sense of the process.)
- Focus on a target audience. show the procedures being done by the "adults" rather than narration with random video clips, and talk to your learner instead of about them.
- Socioeconomic level of students were not presented in an equal fashion.
- Spend more video time on child interactions.
- Closer attention to spelling errors in bulleted information.
- A similar video with more examples of data keeping would be a nice follow-up. Also for middle school teachers on collecting data for specific behavior problems.

Suggestions for Improving Spanish Version:

Needs more variety.

Have a teacher narrate.

Difficult to hear teachers and children.

Make an all-Spanish version (text and narration).

Conclusions:

We met our evaluation criteria by surveying several respondents in various categories (technical experts, teachers, parents) and asked them both rating-scale questions as well as open-ended questions relating to the appeal, effectiveness, and user-friendliness of the written, audio, and video materials in the SPIES video series. As in most evaluation studies, there was too great a variety of responses to represent *every* response here, but we have attempted to capture the most salient and frequently reported responses.

On the topic of general quality and appeal, the video series rated "Good" with the majority of respondents. Overall, the technical experts rated the videos higher than did the learners, but the learners proffered more extensive comments and suggestions; we feel those, along with all the data we have gathered, will become a valuable asset in future production and development of videos like the SPIES series.

Video 1

Mindy Anderson, Marla Bailey, and Cherie Doe
EDUC 6550: Group Project Report, SPIES
Dr. Nick Eastmond
April 16, 1999

The SPIES program was evaluated through the use of questionnaire and interviews. Interviewees included two learners and three experts. The following information includes the position, background, and the level of confidence of each of the interviewees:

	Position	**Background**	**Confidence Level**
Learner 1	Peer Tutor	One year experience with High School age youth.	Good
Learner 2	Intervener; para-professional, student in Special Education	One year experience with physically and intellectually disabled children ages 5-15	Good
Expert 1	Special Education Teacher, severe unit	Ten years experience as a Teacher, 2nd year graduate student in the Speech-Language Pathology program at Utah State University	Excellent
Expert 2	2nd year graduate student in the Speech-Language Pathology program at USU	Bachelor of Science degree in Communication Disorders, 375 clinical clock hours, currently working in a severe unit preschool	Good
Expert 3	Communication Disorders Specialist	One and a half years experience with early intervention, preschool, one year experience with alternative kindergarten intervention, BS degree in Communication disorders, currently a 2nd year graduate student in the Speech-Language Pathology program at USU	Excellent

The results indicating the quality of the product are organized in the following table. The data was analyzed by averaging the number value (1-5, 1= very poor and 5= excellent) given by the interviewees. Questions from the original survey were assigned numbers (see master copy for number assignments) which were organized into the following categories: written, audio, and video.

	Written (Manual)	**Audio**	**Video**
Appeal	Learners: 4.5 avg Experts: 3.6 avg	Learners: 4.3 avg Experts: 3.9 avg	Learners: 4.5 avg Experts: 4.3 avg
Effectiveness	Learners: 4.5 avg Experts: 4.75 avg	Learners: 4.25 avg Experts: 4.3 avg	Learners: 4.4 avg Experts: 4.25 avg
User-Friendliness	Learners: 3.5 avg Experts: 4.75 avg	Learners: 3.75 avg Experts: 3.6 avg	Learners: 4.5 avg Experts: 4.0 avg

Narrative Explanation

- Generally, all interviewees rated from good to excellent, the written and video material as organized and adequately paced.
- All interviewees rated from good to excellent, the effectiveness of the content being taught. It should be noted that the ratings of the written materials scored slightly higher than the video in effectiveness of material presented.
- The instructional objectives were rated from good to excellent in regards to being clearly stated, however, the use of sufficient and relevant examples were rated from fair to good.

Conclusions and Suggestions

In conclusion, the following statements were given by the experts for further development. Additional comments are included:

- "The dubbing over of some things the teacher said was interfering. If a certain phrase is wanted for use as an example, then it needs to be staged– otherwise, comment on the examples as they naturally occur."

- "Give more examples. You could also use poor examples or older techniques [that were developed prior to these newer techniques]."

- "[The] duration of the text on screen was too short on some sections. Voice volume on audio was difficult to understand at times."

- "It was disconcerting at times to see the teacher moving her mouth, but no audio or even contradictory audio was present."

- "For learners it would be helpful to summarize all of the concepts at the end of the video for reinforcement."

- "I thought it was a good video tape. It would be an excellent example for beginning speech people or paraprofessionals."

- "I liked the examples that were natural. The example where the teacher sabotaged the situation by placing the sock on the hand instead of the foot was great!"

It was found that the experts generally gave lower ratings than those of the learners. This may indicate a target audience of parents or paraprofessionals would find the video useful. The experts tended to be more critical of the content than the target audience, however, the experts may want to use the material for training and inservice.

Video 1 (Spanish Version)

Jennifer Merritt
Wendy Warner
Spies Project
Spanish Edition
April 17, 1999

A. Data gathering process

We asked two parents and two experts to watch the Spanish version of video 1 of the SPIES series, and answer the questionnaire. The parents were given the opportunity to ask questions, but the professionals viewed the videos alone on their own time.

1. Experts
   a. Amy Burgoyne is an expert in the area of speech and language pathology. She works mostly with young children and is fluent in Spanish.
   b. Jen Merritt is an expert in the area of audiology. She works with children of all ages and is also a fluent Spanish-speaker.

2. Learners
   a. Derek Jack is a new parent who speaks Spanish fluently.
   b. Ruth Jack is Derek's wife. She also speaks Spanish.

3. Level of confidence
   Both the experts and the learners appeared to be interested in answering the questions. The quality of responses was good.

B. Results

	Audio Expert/Learner	Video Expert/Learner
Appeal	• Narration uninteresting • Need Spanish audio	• Use teachers more in teaching concepts
Effectiveness	• Subtitles are difficult to follow	• Good content • Helpful ideas
User-friendliness	• All on-screen text and narration should be in Spanish	• Who was the video made for? • Good translation

No written materials were available in Spanish, so that column was not applicable. Also, because the experts and learners had very similar comments, we grouped the above results together.

The main themes that we found were that the subtitles were hard to follow, and everyone

agreed that the video should be dubbed in Spanish with Spanish on-screen text (not subtitles, but Spanish text in place of the English text). Another common comment was that the narration was a little boring. More teacher involvement was suggested.

1. Organization and Pace
    - Rated with 4s and 5s
    - Spanish subtitles moved too quickly
2. Effectiveness/objectives
    - Rated with 4s and 5s
    - Good content, but presentation was a little slow
3. Other suggestions
    - More variety
    - All text and narration should be in Spanish

C. Conclusions and Suggestions
- Have a teacher narrate
- Difficult to hear teachers and children
- Make an all-Spanish version (text and narration)
- Who was it made for

Observations during interviews

We were not present during the viewing by the experts

learners

- concentrated on video
- stopped and asked questions
- didn't understand the purpose–after we discussed it they understood
- made comments during the video

Video 2

Formative Evaluations For Module 2, "Providing Help"

"Providing Help" is designed for adults (teachers, day care providers, and parents) who work or live with preschool children who have disabilities, special health needs, or who are at risk for the development of a disability. In "Providing Help" four forms of help are defined and illustrated using examples of adults interacting with preschool children in natural settings (home, school, or stores). Three help strategies are also defined and illustrated using examples of adults interacting with preschool children in natural settings.

Data Gathering Process

Three learners and three experts in the fields of early childhood education and child development were interviewed. The interview consisted of viewing the video with each person, asking the participants for their comments, and having the participants complete a questionnaire.

A. Interviewees - Learners

1. Karmen Blanthorn is an Elementary Education Teacher with a Special Education Endorsement. Karmen is very knowledgeable about issues in special education. I am very confident with her evaluation.

2. Tifnee Anderson is a parent and a preschool teacher. Tifnee has worked with autistic children. I am confident with her evaluation.

3. Debbie Pugsley is a parent and a Special Education Aide. Debbie works with autistic children and students with special needs. I am confident with her evaluation, but she is still new in the field and is very much a learner.

B. Results

Quality of the Product

	Written	Audio	Video
Appeal	• Nice outlines • Good supplement	• Sufficient	• Good sequencing • Is it about over?
Effectiveness	• Readable • Comprehensive	• Audible • Dry at times	• Common sense information • Real life examples
User-Friendliness	• Easy-to-follow	• No comments	• Easy-to-follow • Good outlines for beginners

Written- The information was very complete, providing a good outline to be followed during possible follow-up learning sessions. The material could act as a supplement for other programs currently being used. It was readable and easy-to-follow.

Audio- All comments centered on the fact that it could be heard. The background music used was not the most liked at times.

Video- The video was very well organized, following clear objectives. Most of the information presented was common sense, and left the viewers wondering how long this was going to continue. Are we going to learn anything new?

7. The pacing was slow at times. Viewers felt it was dragging and needed to end or move on. Organization was excellent, following a clear and directed plan.

8. The product is very useful for learners. Parents and teachers who are being presented this information for the first time have a great deal to gain. Experienced individuals can use it as a review.

9. Possible adaptation of the skills presented to older students and extension of skills to regular education students. Excite the narrator!! Use humor and do away with the monotone nature of the audio.

C. Conclusions and suggestions

- Pace was too slow
- Excellent organization
- Product is very useful

A. Interviewees - Experts

1. Barb Fiechtl is an instructor in the Department of Special Education at Utah State University. Barb has a Masters Degree in Special Education, and has been involved in the field for 24 years. Her expertise is in the areas of early childhood education and the education of children with severe needs. For these reasons, I have a high degree of confidence in Barb's responses.

2. Shelley Lindauer is an Associate Professor of Family and Human Development and the Director of the Child Development Lab at Utah State University. Shelley has a Bachelors degree in Early Childhood Education and both her Masters and Ph.D. are in Child Development. She has worked at Utah State for 16 years and has worked in the field for 24 years. I have a high degree of confidence in Shelley's responses.

3. Marti Dever is an Associate Professor in the Department of Elementary Education at Utah State University. Marti has a Masters in Early Childhood Education and an Ed.D. in Education. She has worked at Utah State for 6 years and has worked in the field for 29 years. I have a high degree of confidence in Marti's responses.

B. Results

Quality of the Product

	Written	Audio	Video
Appeal	• Easy-to-follow • Understandable	• Great • Pleasant voice	• Very appealing
Effectiveness	• Written clearly • Helpful	• Great	• Excellent • Great material
User-Friendliness	• Very user friendly • Jargon-free language	• Understandable	• Good examples • Paced well

Written- The experts thought the manual was easy-to-follow, understandable, and helpful. They felt that the material was presented in simple, jargon-free language. Two out of three thought the use of advanced organizers was excellent and everyone thought the use of objectives was excellent.

Audio- There were very few comments made specifically in regard to the audio portion. One person commented that the audio was very appealing and the narrator's voice was pleasant.

Video- Two out of three experts rated the video as being excellent in presenting up-to-date information. All three commented on the use of good examples throughout and thought that the material was paced well. One person especially liked the idea of using natural settings.

7. The experts thought that the material was well-organized and was paced very well.

8. One expert said that she thought the program taught the subject matter very well. Two of the three experts said that they thought a lot depended upon the facilitator. One person felt some clarity was needed in regard to assessing students' needs for help. Everyone agreed that the objectives were clearly stated. One person thought that more examples would be helpful to illustrate verbal help.

9. Some suggestions experts had for future development were to provide guidelines for using the help strategies, such as, "This strategy is good when. . ." Also, to focus more questions on such as, When? Why? What to do? How? One person suggested to replace the word "age" with "stage"in the Introduction to SPIES, under "Naturalistic Methods of Instruction", where it reads, ". . . Developmentally appropriate activities are those that other children of the same **age** choose to do and that promote learning and development by keeping children actively engaged." Finally, one person suggested interspersing more video examples with the graphics so viewers are not just looking at words on the screen.

C. Conclusions and suggestions

- Well-organized and paced well
- Objectives are clearly stated
- Provide guidelines for using help strategies

Interview Notes

1. Before Barb Fiechtl and I began watching the video, we agreed to pause after section so she could share her responses. Here are some of Barb's comments:

The examples provided in the section Physical Help were good, except for two. In the first example a parent was demonstrating the use of full physical help by using hand-over-hand guidance. In this example the visual is not effective because you can't see what the parent's hands are doing. In the second example a teacher was demonstrating the use of partial physical help. The teacher is shown helping a student pour juice, but the teacher appears to be providing full physical help instead of partial physical help.

The television we used had closed captions. Barb mentioned that the "g's" and "y's" were hard to read in the captions. We noticed one example in which the closed caption blocked the view of the intervention that was being demonstrated.

The examples in the section Verbal Help could be improved. For instance, vary the examples by giving children opportunities to complete tasks other than verbal tasks. Also, provide some isolated examples of direct verbal help and indirect verbal help.

In the section Nonverbal Help, Barb's suggestion was to give children opportunities to respond without prompts.

In the Most-To-Least Help Strategy section, the authors state that rationale for this strategy is to encourage children to respond with few or no errors. Barb disagreed with this statement, she said that the Most-To-Least strategy is to designed to produce errorless learning.

In the Least-To-Most section Barb commented that some of the scenes were dark. Also, the mother in the examples speaks to the child, but doesn't use prompts.

In the final section on Progressive Time Delay, Barb felt that the examples were good. However, they don't provide the viewers with any idea of how long this process takes.

Finally, Barb thought the video could be strengthened by providing the viewers with guidelines for using the various strategies, such as, "This strategy is good when. . ."

2. Before Marti Dever and I began viewing the film, we agreed to pause between sections so she could share her responses. Here are some of Marti's comments:

Marti liked the notion of doing things in a natural setting. She said she thought that it was very appropriate. Marti thought that the examples in Physical Help seemed logical. Also, she thought that the examples presented a nice way to think about scaffolding children's learning.

Marti commented that the distinction between direct and indirect help in Verbal Help seemed fuzzy.

Marti felt that some discussion on when to use Non-Verbal Help would be helpful. Also, she wondered how this continuum worked. She thought that there should be some mention of doing an initial assessment on the child to determine where they are.

Marti thought the examples in the Least-To-Most Help Strategy section were more clear than the examples in the Most-To-Least section. She commented that it would be helpful to have some guidelines on which strategy to use.

Marti's question after watching the Progressive Time Delay Strategy, was, "Is precision that critical?"

In response to the question, "How well does the program teach?", Marti replied that a lot depends on the facilitator. She liked the material. She thought that the objectives were stated clearly.

The only suggestion Marti had was to change the word "age" to "stage", as I described above.

3. Shelley Lindauer and I agreed to pause the video after each section so she could share her responses. Here are some of Shelley's comments:

In the Physical Help section, Shelley thought the examples were good with enough variety to keep it interesting. She liked that some examples were in school and some examples were in the home. She also thought that the examples provided good modeling.

Shelley's question after viewing the section on Modeled Help, was, "How does a parent or teacher know when to give full or partial help?"

Shelly thought it would be helpful to have more examples in the Verbal Help section. She said that this is a difficult thing to teach teachers because so much is intuitive. On the other hand, Shelley thought the examples provided in the Non-Verbal Help section were good.

In the Most-To-Least Help Strategy section, Shelley thought the examples were effective and that is was a great sequence using the same child. Similarly, Shelley thought that the examples were really good and paced well in the Least-To-Most section.

Shelley thought that it was a neat idea to show a sibling in the examples for Progressive Time Delay. However, she didn't feel that the examples were as strong as the other two help strategies and that the example seemed more "set up".

Shelley thought that the overall quality was very good, very user-friendly, clear, and moved quickly. Her suggestion for future development was to provide suggestions for determining why you do what you do and when you do it.

Video 3

1A. Describe the data gathering process you used

Data was gathered from two-video experts and two-learners. The video experts direct, produce, and edit training videos for adult learners. Additionally they are instructional designers and have developed paper-based training. One of the video experts is a graduate of the Instructional Technology Department at Utah State University. The other expert is a graduate of Utah State Teacher Education program. Each has between 12 and 8 years in instructional design. They understand the concepts of learning theory, test and measurements, and objectives. The video experts selected have been in the training and video field for 12 and 8 years respectively. Because the individuals were expert in the training video business and have developed numerous training videos for instructional purposes I felt there input would be worthwhile and they could give honest and critical feedback. On a scale of 1 to 5 my confidence in their ability to rate the video production and visual components a 5.

The two learners are both parents with two children each. They are also instructional designers but they do not design in the area of small children and their children are no longer of preschool age. However the two learners do understand objectives, testing and measuring, and the basic laws of learning because of their work in instructional design. On a scale of 1 to 5 my confidence in their ability to rate the material objectively and accurately is a 3. I rate them a 3 because of their lengthy work in adult education. After the interview I believe their extensive work in adult education corrupted their judgement to fairly evaluate a video concerning preschool intervention. Additionally their children are beyond the preschool years. The biggest factor in rating my confidence level a 3 is all their work in adult education. I think they find it hard to separate the learning concepts and rightfully so. But overall the evaluations performed were an honest attempt to rate the training video fairly and accurately.

1B. Results from the video (technical) experts.

	Written Material	Audio	Video
Appeal	Rated Good Overall	Rated Fair Overall	Rated Good Overall
Effectiveness	Rated Fair Overall	Rated Good Overall	Rated Good Overall
User Friendly	Not Rated	Rated Good Overall	Rated Fair Overall

Figure 1. Results from the Video Experts

Data Gathered from the two-video experts reiterated below in bulleted format.

- Production Components
  - ✓ Quality of images, 3 blocks marked as fair, 3 blocks marked as good
  - ✓ Audio, 1 block marked as fair, 4 blocks marked as good
  - ✓ Up-to-date information, rated as good, all 4's, overall
- Visual Components
  - ✓ Transparent camerawork 1 block marked as poor and 1 block marked as good
  - ✓ Lighting rated as good, all 4's, overall
  - ✓ On screen readability rated as good, all 4's, overall
  - ✓ Overall quality of visual images rated as fair, all 3's, overall.
- Instructional Content
  - ✓ Use of advanced organizers not rated and rated as good
  - ✓ Use of objectives, sticking to the main topic, adequate time for mental processing, use of understandable language rated as good, all 4's, overall. .
  - ✓ Use of sufficient relevant examples rated as fair, all 3's, overall.
- Affective Components
  - ✓ Presentation of Material rated as poor, all 2's, overall
  - ✓ Material holds the interest throughout rated as poor, all 2's, overall
  - ✓ Applicability rated as fair, all 3's, overall
  - ✓ Humor not rated in either evaluation or marked as N/A, not applicable

1B. Results from the learners.

	Written Material	Audio	Video
Appeal	Rated Good Overall	Rated Fair Overall	Rated Good Overall
Effectiveness	Rated Fair Overall	Rated Good Overall	Rated Good Overall
User Friendly	Rated Good Overall	Rated Good Overall	Rated Fair Overall

Figure 2. Results from the Learners

- Production Components
  - ✓ Quality of images rated as good, all 4's, overall
  - ✓ Audio, 1 block marked as poor, 2 blocks marked as fair, 3 blocks marked as good
  - ✓ Up-to-date information, 1 block marked as fair and 1 block marked as good
- Visual Components
  - ✓ Transparent camerawork, rated as good, all 4's, overall
  - ✓ Lighting rated as good, all 4's, overall
  - ✓ On screen readability 1 block marked as fair and 1 block marked as good
  - ✓ Overall quality of visual images 1 block marked as fair and 1 block marked as good
- Instructional Content
  - ✓ Use of advanced organizers 1 block marked as fair and 1 block marked as good
  - ✓ Use of objectives, sticking to the main topic, adequate time for mental processing, use of understandable language rated as fair, all 3's, overall with one block, use of objectives rated a poor, a 2
  - ✓ Use of sufficient relevant examples rated as fair, all 3's, overall.
- Affective Components
  - ✓ Presentation of Material, as very poor and poor
  - ✓ Material holds the interest rated as very poor and fair
  - ✓ Applicability rated as poor and good
  - ✓ Use of appropriate humor rated as fair and a question. Is their humor in PHD work?

Conclusions and suggestions

- ✓ Comment: Visually the work was slow and boring
- ✓ Comment: Technically it worked all its objectives
- ✓ Comment: Camera work/lighting was pretty good.
- ✓ Comment: Show some interesting examples to reinforce the subject we have already been introduced to.
- ✓ Comment: Instructionally accurate but boring.

SPIES: Module 3 Evaluation - Incidental Teaching

Description of data gathering process - expert interview

This segment of the Module 3 evaluation was taken from interviews with two experts in the field of Special Education. Both individuals have a Master's in Early Childhood Special Education and a M. Ed. They have between 8 and 17 year's background teaching children who have special needs. Both have had the opportunity to evaluate educational materials to be used to train para-professionals and parents. I feel both of the expert evaluator's were well qualified to give professional evaluations.

Questions were determined prior to the interviews to establish continuity in the evaluation. One interview took place in a confidential office area and the other one in a home. The interview questions where focused on three main components of the Module 3: production components, visual components and the written materials. An additional area was provided for the individuals to write any suggestions or comments.

Results of evaluation

Quality of the Product

Ratings: 1=very poor 2-poor 3=fair 4=good 5=excellent			
	Written Manual	Audio	Video
Appeal	3, 4	4, 3	3, 3
Effectiveness	3, 4	4, 3	4,3

User-friendliness	3, 3	n/a	n/a

Narrative explanation of bulleted points

Written materials: Both experts rated the written materials in this area between fair and good. Some of the written comments were: some terminology may be unknown (e.g. stereotype), more examples beyond reiterating the video examples would be helpful, written materials were both evaluated as well outlined and informative.

Both evaluators were concerned with the professional language that would be difficult for parents to follow.

Audio components: Again the evaluators rated this area between fair to good. If we include up-to-date language we find a fair to good rating. Both evaluators commented about difficulty in hearing child on step with mother. They could not hear the children's responses. Audio portion was not as effective as the video portion. Music did not synchronize with the beginning of some text.

Video: The production quality of the video received a good rating. But quality of visual images received a fair to good rating. Both evaluators commented on the difficulty seeing the quality of video with the child reaching in the circled out portion. They both felt this was confusing to the viewers. It may have been better to leave out the circle around the child. Text was clear on the screen but there was confusion because audio voice was moving at too rapid a pace.

How well is the material organized and paced?

- ✓ Text was clear on the screen but there was confusion because audio voice was moving at too rapid a pace.
- ✓ Music did not synchronize with words when they first appeared on the screen on a few occasions.
- ✓ Manual was well organized but should be pre-read or followed closely during video presentation if participants are non-professionals.
- ✓ Pacing was a little to fast and viewers needed to review sections to see if they understood the concepts.
- ✓ Both thought the material was in the fair range for the way the material was organized and ease to follow.

How well does the product teach?

- ✓ Both evaluators felt that a person would have to have an educational background in the field and be very familiar with the terminology to keep pace with the video and understand what it was teaching.
- ✓ Instructional objectives had a good rating for being clearly stated.
- ✓ Time was allocated for discussion time during video presentation for audience to ask questions.

Suggestions and Comments for modifications and future development - expert evaluators

- ✓ It was confusing to mix other children's examples in with Ellie's hand washing scene. It would be better to keep her instruction separate from the other's and just use her at the beginning as an example of the proper way to do incidental teaching.
- ✓ It would be good to avoid narration on top of scenes that include audio - Ellie's scene.

- ✓ It would be better to get better quality audio recording of children's responses so that they could be heard on the video. If they can't be heard, then maybe they should use subtitles.

Note: Both evaluators were told and could see from the title on the written material and the video portion of the instruction that the SPIES materials were designed for families and professionals working with children with special needs. At the conclusion of the viewing and reading the materials both left the following explanations:

- ✓ Comment: The person viewing this material would have to have an educational background and be very familiar with the terminology to keep pace with the video. The video was geared more toward professionals and not user friendly to families.
- ✓ Comment: If the program is for parent use, there needs to be more explanation, slower pace, slower talking. It's for parents to follow and get help.
- ✓ Comment: Longer video segments to follow the concepts - especially for parents.
- ✓ Comment: Avoid narration on top of scenes that include audio (Ellie's scene).
- ✓ Comment: If child verbal initiation or responses are hard to understand/hear, use subtitles.

Education 6550 - Dr. Eastmond
April 14, 1999
Dixie Jenson

SPIES: Module 3 Evaluation - Incidental Teaching

Description of data gathering process - expert interview

This segment of the Module 3 evaluation was taken from interviews with two experts in the field of Special Education. Both individuals have a Master's in Early Childhood Special Education and an M. Ed. They have between 8 - 17 years background teaching children who have special needs. Both have had the opportunity to evaluate educational materials to be used to train para professionals and parents. Is feel both of the expert evaluator's were well qualified to give professional evaluations.

Questions were determined prior to the interviews to establish continuity in the evaluation. One interview took place in a confidential office area and the other one in a home. The interview questions where focused on three main components of the Module 3: production components, visual components and the written materials. An additional area was provided for the individuals to write any suggestions or comments.

Results of evaluation

Quality of the Product

Ratings: 1=very poor 2-poor 3=fair 4=good 5=excellent			
	Written Manual	Audio	Video
Appeal	3, 4	4, 3	3, 3
Effectiveness	3, 4	4, 3	4,3
User-friendliness	3, 3	n/a	n/a

Narrative explanation of bulleted points

Written materials - both experts rated the written materials in this area between fair and good. Some of the written comments were: some terminology may be unknown (e.g. stereotype), more examples beyond reiterating the video examples would be helpful, written materials were both evaluated as well outlined and informative.

Both evaluators were concerned with the professional language that would be difficult for parents to follow.

Audio components - again the evaluators rated this area between fair to good. If we include up-to-date language we find a fair to good rating. Both evaluators commented about difficulty in hearing child on step with mother. They could not hear the children's responses. Audio portion was not as effective as the video portion. Music did not synchronize with the beginning of some text.

Video - the production quality of the video received a good rating. But quality of visual images received a fair to good rating. Both evaluators commented on the difficulty seeing the quality of video with the child reaching in the circled out portion. They both felt this was confusing to the viewers. It may have been better to leave out the circle around the child. Text was clear on the screen but there was confusion because audio voice was moving at too rapid a pace.

How well is the material organized and paced?

- Text was clear on the screen but there was confusion because audio voice was moving at too rapid a pace.
- Music did not synchronize with words when they first appeared on the screen on a few occasions.

- Manual was well organized but should be pre-read or followed closely during video presentation if participants are non-professionals.
- Pacing was a little to fast and viewers needed to review sections to see if they understood the concepts.
- Both thought the material was in the fair range for the way the material was organized and ease to follow.

How well does the product teach?

- Both evaluators felt that a person would have to have an educational background in the field and be very familiar with the terminology to keep pace with the video and understand what it was teaching.
- Instructional objectives had a good rating for being clearly stated.
- Time was allocated for discussion time during video presentation for audience to ask questions.

Suggestions and Comments for modifications and future development - expert evaluators

- It was confusing to mix other children's examples in with Ellie's hand washing scene. It would be better to keep her instruction separate from the other's and just use her at the beginning as an example of the proper way to do incidental teaching.
-It would be good to avoid narration on top of scenes that include audio - Ellie's scene.
-It would be better to get better quality audio recording of children's responses so that they could be heard on the video. If they can't be heard, then maybe they should use subtitles.

Note: Both evaluators were told and could see from the title on the written material and the video portion of the instruction that the SPIES materials were designed for families and

professionals working with children with special needs. At the conclusion of the viewing and reading the materials both left the following explanations:

Comment: The person viewing this material would have to have an educational background and be very familiar with the terminology to keep pace with the video. The video was geared more toward professionals and not user friendly to families.

Comment: If the program is for parent use, there needs to be more explanation, slower pace, slower talking. It's for parents to follow and get help.

Comment: Longer video segments to follow the concepts - especially for parents.

Comment: Avoid narration on top of scenes that include audio (Ellie's scene).

Comment: If child verbal initiation or responses are hard to understand/hear, use subtitles.

Video 4

Cloe Russell
Lory Farr

Evaluation of Module 4 SPIES Video:
Tracking Progress

I. Evaluation questions and data gathering process.

A. Persons Interviewed

1. Expert

- Currently directs the filming of educational videos at USU's CPD department.. Has a B.A. in Film production and M.S. in Instructional Technology. Has had 9 years experience in video/film and 3 years in Instructional Development.

2. Teachers

- Teacher #1 - Dr. of Education who has had experience with all ages for the past 40 years. He is well-renowned in behavioral science, child care, and authored many books and articles on this subject. Has had experience in making videos of this type.
- Teacher #2 - B.S. in Family and Human Development/Psychology. Three years experience with adults with behavior problems as director of program. Two years working on similar project. Teacher of behavior management to paraprofessional.
- Teacher #3 - Middle school special education teacher. Has a B.S. in Special Education. Has taught for 14 years in public schools.

3. Parents

- Parent #1 - Special Education Aid for five years at a public school district, responsible for main streaming adolescents 12 years of age and up from education settings to employment.
- Parent #2 - Parent of a two and a five-year old. Has had experience as a para professional in a special education classroom. Has three years of college and majored in Communicative Disorders. Presently works in the home.

B. Results

1. Written materials

- Teacher #1 mentioned that the written material should be more consistent with the video material (see post-it notes).

2. Audio

- Five interviewees gave the quality of audio a "4" and one gave it a "5."

3. Video

- Our expert gave a "2" for transparent camera work, "5" for sufficient lighting, and "4" for readability and image quality.
- Teacher #1 had no comments about the quality of the video in addition to his rating of "4" on the scale he circled.
- Teacher #2 gave a "5" for lighting and visual images. She said that she saw it on a large screen TV, and on a small screen, it may be too small.
- Teacher #3 gave a "4" for lighting and a "5" for readability and visual images.
- Parent #1 mentioned that the video was not focused in certain places and that it might help to continually show a written index on the screen to give a better sense of orientation.
- Parent #2 gave all "4's" on the visual.

C. Conclusions and Suggestions

- Our expert commented on **effectiveness** and suggested that the text be over the motion video with reduced luminance on video images. Also model the behavior of the teacher on camera (more show not tell). The **quality** of the video was fair for color, excellent for images, but felt that the cameraman made errors, like cutting the heads and bodies off and cutting in and out in views.
- Teacher #1 thought the content was good but had the following comments: The written material should match the video exactly to improve clarity. The pacing might be too fast for beginners. The video duration should not exceed twenty minutes.
- Teacher #2 suggested that to make it user friendly, be less "Techie." Follow one child through the steps to allow the learner to make sense of the process. Steps would seem more relevant. Video needs to show what narrator is saying. There is too much information packed into one sentence. It's intimidating. In summary, slow down, follow the procedure through with one person, focus on a target audience, show the procedures being done by the "adults" rather than narration with random video clips, and talk to your learner instead of about them.
- Teacher #3 though the video would be very helpful for a university student in special ed, or in regular ed. A similar video with more examples of data keeping would be a nice follow-up. Also for middle school teachers on collecting data for specific behavior problems.
- Parent #1 would like more examples, to go a little slower when

introducing concepts and that it would help if on the video it was clearly indicated where they were in the written material i.e. "...on page 23 of the manual..." or to have an index somewhere on the screen with whatever topic being discussed highlighted in some way.

- Parent #2 said it was difficult to follow at the beginning. Need the definition of the measure before going through the process. (She had to make an outline to follow the video sequence.) As a parent only I would not understand why any of this is important, but her background helped her. The examples were not necessarily appropriate for age.

Video 5

SPIES Project

A.

	Learner #1	**Learner #2**	**Expert #3**	**Expert #4**
Position	parents	parents	1st grade teacher	Preschool teacher
Background	parent of 2 BS ComD	parent of 4	1st grade teacher 28 years teaching	1st year teacher
Confidence	high	high	high	medium

B.

	Written Manual	Audio	Video
Appeal	It wasn't available to our viewers at the time of the evaluation.	Quality of Audio GOOD	Sharpness, lighting, color quality, and content all judged to be GOOD TO EXCELLENT
Effectiveness		GOOD	GOOD
User Friendliness		GOOD	FAIR TO GOOD

WRITTEN MANUAL

- We were unaware that our viewers needed to have access to the written material as they watched the video. With several of our viewers out the area we were unable to have them reevaluate the video with the written material.

AUDIO

- All of the viewers rated quality of audio as good. One viewer commented that the narrators voice sounded "slushy." One viewer commented the rate was a little fast.
- All of the viewers indicated that they gained information from the video.
- All the viewers indicated the objectives were clearly stated, and the material was understandable.

VIDEO

- Most of the ratings on transparent camera work, sufficient lighting, readability of onscreen text, and quality of visual images received ratings of good and excellent.
- The organizers, objectives, and applicability of information were all rated as good. The use of examples in the video appeared to be helpful, however, one viewer commented that the "goals of early intervention" needed more examples.
- The language was understandable, up-to-date, and appeared to be presented in an interesting manner.

7. The material was judged to be organized in an excellent manner. One viewer commented the rate was a little fast.
8. The product teaches in an appropriate manner. The objectives were clearly stated and addressed throughout the video. The material was judged to be applicable to the viewers. More examples of the techniques presented would have been helpful during the video.
9. Presentation of further examples would be helpful in the future.

C

Overall the video appeared to be presented in a sufficient and informative way. It was user friendly and the audio and video components were judged to be good overall. Suggestions included commenting on the importance of home involvement with these children. One viewer also indicated that the socioeconomic level of these students were not presented in a equal fashion. For example, the "white children appeared to have a higher socioeconomic level and have less medical challenges visually." More examples throughout the video would also be helpful in future productions.

Video 6

Dan Trimble / Jeramy Jenkins
Research for the Classroom Teacher
Project: SPIES

Video Evaluation: SPIES

Data Collection Process:

Position of Experts:

1. Audiophile, with emphasis in High Fidelity audio. Has no formal training, but is being trained as an audiologist.

2. Graduate student in Audiology. Relevant expertise includes training in principles of audio-science, acoustics, and various audio instrumentation.

- Level of Confidence: Neither of these individuals are audio or video engineers as such but confidence in their opinions, given their experience, is high.

Learner Background and Experience:

1. Certified teachers assistant. Relevant training and history include an Associate degree in education with emphasis in elementary age populations.

2. Bachelors in Family and Human Development with a minor in special education.

- Level of Confidence: Both of these individuals have training and experience in the areas addressed by the video. We have great confidence in the accuracy and appropriateness of their responses.

Results:

	Written	Audio	Video
Appeal	1. Good	4. Fair	7. Fair/good
Effectiveness	2. Good	5. Fair	8. Good
User-Friendliness	3. Good	6. Fair	9. Good

Narrative Explanation:

1. The data from this category was derived from 3 questions. The mean of the scores for clarity was 3.75 on a scale of 1-5 with five being excellent. The mean of the scores for helpfulness was 4.5 or good. The mean of the scores for the appeal to users was 4.25

or good.

2. The mean of the scores for helpfulness was 4.5 or good.

3. The mean of the scores for clarity was 3.75 on a scale of 1-5 with five being excellent. The mean of the scores for helpfulness was 4.5 or good. The mean of these scores being 4.1 which is good.

4. The score for this category was derived from the audio quality question on the questionnaire and from numerous comments. The mean score for the questionnaire was 3.75 or good. The comments regarding the music referred to it's repetitive nature which was reported as distracting from the content. The mean score for the comments regarding the music was 2.3 or poor.

5. The score for this category was derived from the audio quality question on the questionnaire and from numerous comments. The mean score for the questionnaire was 3.75 or good. The comments regarding the music referred to it's repetitive nature which was reported as distracting from the content. The mean score for the comments regarding the music was 2.3 or poor.

6. The score for this category was derived from the audio quality question on the questionnaire and from numerous comments. The mean score for the questionnaire was 3.75 or good. The comments regarding the music referred to it's repetitive nature which was reported as distracting from the content. The mean score for the comments regarding the music was 2.3 or poor.

7. These scores were derived from the questions in the questionnaire relating to video appeal. The mean of the scores for this category were 3.69.

8. These scores were derived from the questions in the questionnaire relating to video effectiveness. The mean of the scores for this category were 3.8.

9. These scores were derived from the questions in the questionnaire relating to video user-friendliness. The mean score was 4.25.

Conclusions and Suggestions:

Based on unanimous responses, planning for the next video series should include more engaging music and visual fields backing the bulleted information sections. Other suggestions include:

1. Spending more video time on child interactions.
2. Closer attention to spelling errors in bulleted information, etc.

Appendix

A. Master Record

B. Sample Questionnaire

C. Proposal for Formative Evaluation

Appendix A: Master Record

Title	Exp	Lnr	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22
1	x		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	2	
1	x		5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	n/a	
1	x		4	4	2	4	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	n/a	
1		x	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	2	
1		x	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	
2	x		3	4	4	5	4	3	4	5	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	n/a	
2	x		4	4	5	n/a	5	4	5	4	5	5	n/a	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	n/a	n/a	
2	x		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	
2		x	5	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	n/a	
2		x	4	4	3	5	4	3	5	3	5	4	3	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	3	5	n/a	
2		x	4	4	4	4	3	3	5	4	5	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	2	4	5	
3	x		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	3	n/a	
3	x		3	3	4	4	2	3	4	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	3	n/a	
3	x		4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	4	5	4	3	
3	x		4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	3	n/a	
3		x	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	4	n/a	
3		x	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	3	
4	x		4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	3	n/a	
4	x		4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	n/a	4	4	4	
4	x		4	4	4	5	n/a	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	n/a	
4	x		3	5	4	5	2	5	4	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	3	4	5	5	1	3	3	4	n/a	
4	x		5	5	4	3	n/a	5	n/a	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	2	1	2	2	2	1	n/a	1	
4		x	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	3	3	n/a	
4		x	4	4	4	n/a	4	4	4	4	2	2	1	2	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	
5	x		5	4	4	5	n/a	3	5	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	1	
5	x		4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	1	4	1	
5		x	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	n/a	
5		x	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	5	4	3	4	3	5	5	5	n/a	
6	x		5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	n/a	
6	x		4	5	3	n/a	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	2	2	3	2	
6		x	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	1	
6		x	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	4	2	
S	x		4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	4
S	x		4	3	3	5	4	3	1	4	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	3	5
S		x	4	4	2	4	4	3	2	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	4	3	4	3	2	3	4	1	
S		x	3	4	3	5	4	3	2	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	4	3	4	3	1	1	2	1	
Ttl Sc			**149**	**149**	**136**	**143**	**133**	**143**	**146**	**144**	**90**	**86**	**80**	**144**	**149**	**153**	**136**	**151**	**131**	**122**	**120**	**133**	**45**	**9**
Ave.	**3.90**		**4.14**	**4.14**	**3.78**	**4.33**	**4.03**	**3.97**	**4.17**	**4**	**4.09**	**3.91**	**3.64**	**4**	**4.26**	**4.25**	**3.78**	**4.19**	**3.64**	**3.39**	**3.43**	**3.8**	**2.37**	**4.5**
Ttl 5s			9	10	4	14	10	9	16	9	8	8	5	11	16	17	9	15	9	9	8	10	2	1
Ttl 4s			23	21	22	16	16	17	13	18	9	7	10	18	14	13	16	15	11	12	10	14	2	1
Ttl 3s			4	5	8	3	5	10	3	9	4	4	4	4	3	4	6	4	12	3	8	7	4	0
Ttl 2s			0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	2	2	4	2	2	9	6	3	4	0
Ttl 1s			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	0	7	0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A. Expert vs. Learner

		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22
Ttl	21	86	86	81	82	71	85	84	86	54	53	49	83	87	87	81	88	75	74	74	75	25	9
Ave.		4.10	4.10	3.86	4.32	3.94	4.05	4.20	4.10	4.15	4.08	4.08	3.95	4.35	4.14	3.86	4.19	3.57	3.70	3.52	3.95	2.50	4.50
Ttl	15	63	63	55	61	62	58	62	58	36	33	31	61	62	66	55	63	56	48	46	58	20	
Ave.		4.20	4.20	3.67	4.36	4.13	3.87	4.13	3.87	4.00	3.67	3.44	4.07	4.13	4.40	3.67	4.20	3.73	3.20	3.07	3.87	2.22	
Ttl Sc		**149**	**149**	**136**	**143**	**133**	**143**	**146**	**144**	**90**	**86**	**80**	**144**	**149**	**153**	**136**	**151**	**131**	**122**	**120**	**133**	**45**	**9**
Ave.		**4.14**	**4.14**	**3.78**	**3.97**	**3.69**	**3.97**	**4.06**	**4.00**	**4.09**	**3.91**	**3.64**	**4.00**	**4.14**	**4.25**	**3.78**	**4.19**	**3.64**	**3.39**	**3.33**	**3.69**	**2.37**	**4.50**
Ttl 5s		9	10	4	14	10	9	16	9	8	8	5	11	16	17	9	15	9	9	8	10	2	1
Ttl 4s		23	21	22	16	16	17	13	18	9	7	10	18	14	13	16	15	11	12	10	14	2	1
Ttl 3s		4	5	8	3	5	10	3	9	4	4	4	4	3	4	6	4	12	3	8	7	4	0
Ttl 2s		0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	2	2	[redacted]	2	2	[redacted]	[redacted]	3	[redacted]	0
Ttl 1s		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	2		0		0

87

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VIDEO EVALUATION FORM FOR SPIES VIDEOS

Video Title:

Proposed Audience:

Length of Video:

Video's Objectives:

Description of Video Content:

Please rate the following elements of the video on a scale of 1-5

1=very poor 2=poor 3=fair 4=good 5=excellent

Production Components:

Color quality of images	1	2	3	4	5
Images in focus/Sharpness of images	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of audio	1	2	3	4	5
Up-to-date information	1	2	3	4	5

Visual Components:

Transparent camera work	1	2	3	4	5
Sufficient lighting	1	2	3	4	5
Readability of on-screen text	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of visual images	1	2	3	4	5

Instructional Content:

Use of advanced organizers	1	2	3	4	5
Use of objectives	1	2	3	4	5
Cohesive content/Video sticks to main topic	1	2	3	4	5
Adequate time for mental processing of information	1	2	3	4	5
Use of understandable and up-to-date language	1	2	3	4	5
Use of sufficient and relevant examples	1	2	3	4	5

Affective Components:

Presentation of material is interesting	1	2	3	4	5
Presentation of material holds interest throughout	1	2	3	4	5
Relatability/applicability of information	1	2	3	4	5
Use of appropriate humor	1	2	3	4	5

Do you have any suggestions/ideas for future development of similar video series?

Please offer any comments or suggestions:

54

EXPERT CHECKLIST FOR SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Please circle one:

Respondent Group= Parent Teacher Technical Expert

If Technical Expert, please indicate your area of expertise:

Proposal for Formative Evaluation of the SPIES Program

Purpose and Objectives:

The purposes for the evaluation of the SPIES program are to answer the following evaluation questions:

1. What is the quality of the product:
   - The written material
   - The audio
   - The video

   with the criteria of:
   - appeal to user
   - effectiveness
   - user-friendliness
7. How well is the material organized and paced?
8. How well does the product teach? Are instructional objectives clearly stated and followed up with help to meet them?
9. Other questions like suggestions for future development which will be asked to experts only.

Steps / Procedures:

The class is to evaluate the whole SPIES series by conducting expert interviews and one-on-one trial with learners. 6 groups of 2 students will each take one video out of the SPIES product and evaluate them with the following steps:

1. Familiarize themselves with the materials as well as possible;
2. Select 2 – 3 experts and to interview with Questionnaire attached;
3. Select 2 – 3 learners for one-on-one-trial with Questionnaire attached;
4. Report data and results of findings